DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 091 SP 033 858

AUTHOR Feiman-Nemser, Sharon; Parker, Michelle B.
TITLE Mentoring in Context: A Comparison of Two U.S. Programs for Beginning Teachers. NCRTL Special Report.
INSTITUTION National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, East Lansing, MI.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO ISSN-1054-7673
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 21p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, 116 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824-1034.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teacher Induction; Case Studies; Change Agents; Collegiality; Comparative Analysis; *Context Effect; Elementary Secondary Education; *Helping Relationship; *Mentors; Program Design; Socialization; Teacher Orientation; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS Albuquerque Public Schools NM; Los Angeles Unified School District CA; *Protege Mentor Relationship

ABSTRACT

This study describes how the contexts of mentoring shape the perspectives and practices of mentors in the Teacher Trainee Program in Los Angeles (California), an effort to recruit candidates to teach in inner city secondary schools by providing on-the-job training to college graduates, and in the Graduate Intern Program in Albuquerque (New Mexico), an effort to extend preservice preparation by offering structured support to beginning elementary teachers. Data were gathered by interviewing and observing mentors and mentees to determine the kinds of things mentor teachers do; the organizational, programmatic, and intellectual contexts in which they work; working conditions; selection procedures; and preparation. A comparative analysis related to broader claims about the power of mentoring to improve teaching is then presented. Three perspectives on mentoring are identified in relation to teacher induction: (1) casting mentors as local guides; (2) casting mentors as educational companions; and (3) viewing mentors as agents of cultural change. Research on what mentoring looks like in different contexts and what novices learn from their interactions with mentors can help policymakers and program planners understand the power and limits of this intervention in order to design more effective programs. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

National Center for Research on Teacher Learning Spring 1992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED346091

NCRTL Special Report

Mentoring in Context: A Comparison of Two U.S. Programs for Beginning Teachers

by Sharon Feiman-Nemser and Michelle B. Parker

Sharon Feiman-Nemser, a professor of teacher education at Michigan State University, is an NCRTL senior researcher. Her interests include the curriculum of teacher education, collaborative reform, learning to teach, and cultures of teaching.

Michelle B. Parker, an instructor in MSU's College of Education, is a research assistant with the NCRTL. Her interests include teacher learning across the career continuum, collaboration and its effects on student learning, teachers' practical knowledge, and professional development schoolwork (content, goals, forms, and roles).

The mentor is supposed to just be there when you need her for whatever. They [the novice teachers] know that, and I establish that with them at the very beginning, that I'm here to help you in any capacity but what I do is make suggestions. And I tell them if you don't follow them it's all right. Maybe what I suggest is something that you feel that you can't use.
—Terri, mentor teacher in Los Angeles

I see myself as someone who thinks with the clients I'm working with and can maybe help turn their thinking toward paths of growth that they think would be useful for themselves. . . . There's also a little bit of me in there thinking, "You know, I wonder if this person knows there's this article or this way you could teach math." So I make suggestions and help people to look at possibilities, but I'd never force them to take that road.
—Pete, support teacher in Albuquerque

In these statements, two experienced teachers working with beginning teachers in different settings define their roles. Both see themselves as helpers, sources of suggestions drawn from their own experience and knowledge of teaching. Neither assumes that the novices they work with have to follow those suggestions and both worry about encroaching on the fragile autonomy of the beginning teacher. Terri tells her mentees that it's all right not to follow her suggestions; Pete says he would never force his clients to pursue the possibilities he raises. In this regard, they reflect the value of individualism so deeply rooted in professional (and popular) culture in the United States.

Besides these similarities in role definition, there are also subtle differences. Terri defines her

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Kennedy
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO33858

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

contribution to novice teachers in terms of emotional support and practical suggestions. Her job is to be there, ready to listen and give counsel. Like Terri, Pete also makes suggestions, but he places more emphasis on thinking through possibilities. Terri's suggestions reflect *her* diagnosis of the situation; after all, she has the experience and expertise. Working from a developmental view of learning, Pete considers beginning teachers' definitions of their own learning needs as well as his knowledge of professional literature and practical alternatives.

These two role definitions echo many of the themes and tensions that run through the U.S. literature on mentoring, especially in relation to teacher induction. The chance to "mentor" a new teacher addresses two serious problems in teaching—the abrupt and unsupported entry of novices into the field and the difficulty of keeping good, experienced teachers in the classroom. The provision of mentor teachers is considered a big improvement over the more typical "sink or swim" experience of many beginning teachers in the United States. Mentoring also offers an incentive to experienced teachers who can take on a new role without giving up classroom teaching.

The "mentor phenomenon" is also related to larger aspirations about improving teaching by transforming professional relations. Little (1990) draws a distinction between social support that puts newcomers at ease and professional support that advances knowledge and practice. From this perspective, the promise of mentoring lies not in its contribution to novices' emotional well-being or survival, but in its capacity to foster an inquiring stance toward teaching and a commitment to developing shared standards for judging good practice.

Both Terri and Pete work in assistance-oriented programs for beginning teachers.[1] As a mentor teacher in Los Angeles, Terri works with beginning secondary teachers enrolled in an alternative certification program sponsored by the school district. The beginning teachers, called *trainees*, are college graduates with no previous professional preparation. As a support teacher in Albuquerque, Pete works with beginning elementary teachers, some of whom are also enrolled in a master's program at the University of New Mexico. Called *graduate interns*, these beginning teachers have completed a preservice program.

The Los Angeles and Albuquerque programs are part of a larger study of teacher education and learning to teach conducted by the National Center for Research on Teacher Education[2] at Michigan State University (National Center for Research on Teacher Education, 1988). The Center chose these two programs because each represents a significant policy initiative in current efforts to improve teaching. The Teacher Trainee Program in Los Angeles is a serious effort to recruit strong candidates to teach in hard-to-staff, inner city secondary schools by providing on-the-job training to college graduates (Stoddart & Floden, in press). The Graduate Intern Program in Albuquerque is a serious effort to extend preservice preparation by offering structured support to beginning elementary teachers (Odell, 1990).

The opportunity to study two U.S. programs where experienced teachers play a central role in the induction and socialization of beginning teachers enabled us to consider how different contexts support different versions of mentoring. Observing mentor teachers and support teachers in these two settings as they worked with beginning teachers and interviewing them about what they did and how they thought about it, we noted striking differences in the way they defined and enacted their roles. As we learned more about the overall programs as well as about how mentors and support teachers are selected and prepared in each setting, we began to see how the conditions of mentoring shaped the practices of mentors.

In this paper we explore connections between what mentor teachers and support teachers do and the organizational, programmatic, and intellectual contexts in which they work. First, we discuss the working conditions, selection procedures, and preparation that mentors and support teachers receive. Then we present brief descriptions of mentoring to illustrate common characteristics of the practices we observed in Los Angeles and Albuquerque and to show how they relate to contextual factors. In the concluding section, we relate our comparative analysis to broader claims about the power of mentoring to improve teaching.

The Contexts of Mentoring

Several aspects of context seem especially important in accounting for the kind of mentoring we observed and in explaining differences in mentors' roles and practices. These include the job description itself, the programmatic setting, the selection process, and the preparation that mentors receive. The job description and programmatic setting define the conditions of the work, the selection process defines relevant personal experiences and qualities, and the training or preparation defines the intellectual framework and concrete images that guide what mentors do. These factors seem to influence how mentors conceive and carry out their work.

Conditions of Work

By "conditions of work" we mean the time allocated for mentors to do their work, the structure of the program in which their work is embedded, and the extent to which mentors practice alone or with the support of colleagues. The comparison between Los Angeles and Albuquerque underscores how much these variables affect the opportunity mentors have to mentor and as well as the character and quality of what they do and how they think about it.

Mentoring part time and on your own. In Los Angeles, all mentor teachers are assigned to work with beginning teachers in the teacher trainee program, an alternate training and certification program. The state pays each mentor a stipend of $4000 and gives local districts $2000 to cover such costs as substitute teachers and travel. While the state requires mentors to continue teaching 60 percent of the time, the district lacks the resources to reduce the mentor teacher's class load. As a result, mentors in Los Angeles teach full time and fit their mentoring in around the edges. Their term lasts three years.

From her office in the district's downtown quarters, the director of the Mentor Teacher Program oversees the selection, training, and assignment of over 1200 mentors a year. Asked to define the mentor's role, she said:

> Mentors are to guide the new teachers, to provide assistance, to help them in securing skills—all the things that the teachers are lacking, that they have either not had because they've not had any teacher classes and those everyday things that they learn just by virtue of teaching.

Later she described the kind of local help that mentors should be giving across the school year. At the beginning, mentors should help new teachers figure out what content to cover and how to break that down into quarterly, unit, and daily lesson plans; where to keep attendance cards; how to avoid discipline problems. When the first grading period comes around, the mentor should show the novice how to record grades, stressing the importance of keeping gradebooks in order. At the end of the school year, the mentor should help the new teacher fill out end-of-the-year records so that everything will be in order for the next teacher.

Mentor teachers work with two to four trainees located in the school where they teach or at a nearby school. To minimize the time they spend away from their own students, mentor teachers often talk with novices before or after school or during lunch if they teach in the same building. If they want to visit the new teacher's classroom, they have to arrange for a substitute to cover their own class.

According to one mentor we interviewed, the "best of all possible worlds" is to work with novices in a school where you have been successful and where you are perceived by the administration and the other teachers as a leader. This not only guarantees peer support; it also means that the mentor is readily available to the novice as the need arises.

> Working with a new teacher, oftentimes things happen. I know that Carol [a trainee] comes in at nutrition [recess] and says, "I've got to talk. Something has really happened." And I'm there for her. That doesn't happen when you report to a school where you don't know your way around in the first place and then every couple of weeks, you check in with the young person and you never really get a chance to develop a relationship.

Interestingly, in describing the ideal working situation, this mentor did not mention being assigned to trainees in her subject area. In most cases, mentors and trainees do teach the same subject, but not always. Obviously this has consequences for the kind of guidance a mentor can provide. One trainee we interviewed described her less than ideal situation:

> I had a mentor teacher. She was at a different school and she was in a different subject area so it was harder to communicate. She wasn't there at my door asking me. She wasn't readily available where I could take her off to the side and then, she wasn't in my subject matter so she didn't feel comfortable with teaching math.

Mentors provide the school-based portion of the teacher trainee program which includes a three-week session before the school year begins and weekly seminars and workshops during the year. Although the administrative staffs of the mentor teacher and teacher trainee programs work closely together, the programs themselves are managed separately. One result is that the mentor teachers we studied knew little about what the teacher trainees were exposed to in their workshops and seminars. Like cooperating teachers in conventional preservice programs, they did not have the information to help trainees draw connections between the academic and the clinical components of their program.

The mentor teacher program tries to help mentors feel a part of something large and important. The training communicates this message. In addition, mentors are given a directory of trainees, a mentor pin, a training notebook, business cards, and a bag to carry all their supplies. Some regions in the district hold monthly meetings. According to one administrator, mentors appreciate the opportunity to get together and talk among themselves "because they feel comfortable that you have the same problem and it's really not me."

In schools with large numbers of new teachers, mentors sometimes meet on their own to plan school-wide orientation programs. By and large, however, once mentors complete their required training, they are pretty much on their own. As one mentor explained: "The district is very large, and when we are made mentors we are turned loose. I keep abreast of teacher training mostly through trying to read professional journals and keeping up on research."

Full-time mentoring within a community of learners. In Albuquerque, people use the term *clinical support* to describe what experienced teachers do with beginning teachers. The term *support* is supposed to signal the absence of formal responsibility for evaluation.

The director of the Graduate Intern Program has a clear idea of the kinds of support that beginning teachers need and that support teachers should offer. She detailed these in an interview with us:

> The support teachers bring resources and materials to new teachers. They offer instructional assistance related to content and methodology. They give a lot of emotional support through empathetic listening and sharing experiences. . . . In all this, support teachers work from cues that they receive from new teachers.

Later in the same interview, the director offered additional evidence of the developmental orientation in Albuquerque: "If we were to blend assistance and assessment in New Mexico, we would sacrifice the patience that sometimes is necessary in order for people to demonstrate growth."

Support teachers work full time with beginning teachers. This is possible because of a unique collaborative arrangement between the University of New Mexico and the Albuquerque Public Schools. The University accepts 28 interns into a special master's program. During the school year, interns teach fulltime in the district while receiving a fellowship stipend equal to half of a beginning teacher's salary. The money saved by not paying full salaries to these 28 beginning teachers enables the district to release seventeen experienced teachers to work full time for two years in the preservice and induction programs. These teachers continue to receive their regular salary and benefits.

The eight support teachers work with graduate interns as well as with other first-year teachers in the district. Each support teacher has between 10-12 "clients," usually clustered in three or four schools, whom they visit once a week. Besides this one-to-one, school-based work, each support teacher forms a study group with his or her clients that meets every other week. The agenda for these meetings emerges from the concerns of the participants.

Support teachers attend the Wednesday evening intern seminar taught by the director of the program and a professor from the University. By participating in this seminar, support teachers learn what interns are reading and discussing so that they can help them make connections with their teaching. The professor responsible for the seminar encourages support teachers to take part in the seminar and "model thinking about teaching": "You can function as models, bring in your experience, show them how to think about their own thinking and learning."

On Friday mornings, support teachers meet with the director in a three-hour staff seminar for which they receive graduate credit. Here they talk about their ongoing work with clients, read and discuss pertinent articles, and conduct program business. In addition, the support teachers are divided into two teams, each containing new and seasoned support teachers. The teams meet informally as a support group. They also take turns publishing a monthly newsletter for all new teachers in the district.

Finally, support teachers receive tuition vouchers so that they can take a course each term at the University. Further evidence of the commitment to continued learning promoted by the program, this opportunity is possible because of the full-time status of support teachers. During the two years we studied the Albuquerque program, support teachers took courses in Spanish, creative writing, aerobics, supervision, and administration.

Support teachers value the flexibility and control that they have over their schedule. Though they work hard and often late, they appreciate the chance to go out for lunch, run errands during the day, and arrange their own calendars which they turn in to the director each Friday.

Analysis. In comparing the working conditions of mentor teachers in Los Angeles and Albuquerque, several differences stand out. The first concerns the part-time versus full time status of mentors. The second concerns the structural relationship between the mentor component and the beginning teacher program. The third concerns the social context of mentoring. These factors not only affect the time available for mentoring, they also influence the ways that mentors can learn about and experience their new role.

Because mentors in Los Angeles teach full time, balancing obligations to students and novice teachers, they have limited time to work with trainees and to discuss their work with fellow mentors. This may help explain why we saw more advice giving in Los Angeles. When time is short, telling beginning teachers what to do may be more efficient than helping them think through alternative possibilities. Support teachers in Albuquerque do not have classroom responsibilities. This means they have time to work in a developmental way with interns and time to meet regularly with colleagues.

As an integral part of the Graduate Intern Program, support teachers know what is going on in all of the program components. Thus they can help interns connect the ideas and information they encounter in seminars and workshops with the experiences they have in school. The situation is quite different in Los Angeles where mentor teachers know little about what goes on in the academic components of the teacher trainee program. Besides limiting the mentor teacher's contribution to trainees' learning, it also reinforces the mentors' feeling that they are on their own.

By and large, mentor teachers in Los Angeles shoulder their new responsibilities without the aid and support of fellow mentors. Once their training is over, they are on their own, much like most beginning teachers who survive without the help of a mentor. The opposite is true for support teachers in Albuquerque. As members of a professional learning community, they have regular opportunities to problem solve with colleagues and to evolve a shared understanding of their role.

Choosing Mentor Teachers and Support Teachers

While the working conditions set the boundaries within which mentors work, the selection process further defines role expectations and practices. What a program looks for in applicants says something about what mentor teachers should be like, what they need to know, and what they should be able to do. In this section we highlight features of the selection process that reinforce official role definitions and reveal similarities and differences in the conceptual underpinnings of the two programs.

Some differences in the selection procedures stem from differences in the sheer size of the two programs. In Los Angeles, for example, a standing committee of three union and three district officials oversees all phases of the mentor selection process which includes holding district-wide elections for regional selection committees and providing six hours of training on how to review applications and observe, interview, and rate those who apply. About a third of the applicants, or 1200 mentors, are chosen through this process. The elaborate procedures are designed to ensure equity and fairness in a context where selection committee members will not know the candidates.

In Albuquerque, where the numbers are smaller, the procedures are less bureaucratic. Two-person teams consisting of a principal and a practicing support teacher interview all applicants (60-70 teachers) and select about 20 who return for a second interview with the program director, the director of elementary education at the University, and the district's coordinator of staff development.

From this pool, 8 support teachers (and 9 clinical supervisors) are chosen.

We were particularly interested in what the selection criteria say about what it takes to be a good mentor in Los Angeles and Albuquerque. To that end, we interviewed program directors and analyzed application forms, interview schedules, observation guides and rating sheets. From these sources, we discovered some clear similarities. Both programs seek mentor teachers who are reputed to be excellent practitioners and both programs rely on the testimony of principals and colleagues. But we also discovered some striking differences in what programs are looking for.

An emphasis on teaching performance. The Los Angeles process seems to emphasize teachers' classroom performance. According to the application form, mentor teachers must "demonstrate evidence of effectiveness in classroom management, discipline, directed instruction, and communication with peers." The central event is the classroom observation. The fact that L.A. sends trained observers to watch each candidate teach a lesson is all the more significant given the sheer numbers involved.

The observation guide favors a particular kind of teaching, called *direct instruction*. Observers look for evidence that the applicant's lesson follows the district-approved format with stated objectives, instruction, guided group practice, independent practice and evaluation. Many of the recommended follow-up interview questions deal with the lesson itself (e.g., "Tell me about your lesson objectives today." "How do you feel students were responding?" "What would you do differently?").

An emphasis on thinking and learning. The Albuquerque program also seeks support teachers who are good with children. While there is no formal classroom observation, two interview questions focus on the candidate's teaching: "If we were to visit your classroom, what would we see children doing?" "What assumptions about teaching and learning inform your work with children?" Interviewers also ask candidates to respond to vignettes about situations that could arise in their classroom or in their novices' classrooms. Still, the orientation of the interview is less on the teacher's classroom performance and more on student activities and teacher thinking.

The Albuquerque process seems to stress the candidate's personal qualities as leader, learner, and member of a team. Interviewers are asked to consider the following: Does the candidate have a "realistic view of self?" Is the candidate "flexible, tolerant of individual differences and capable of learning from new situations?" Does the candidate "demonstrate enthusiasm for learning?" As the director explained: "We are making sure that people are very open to learning, that they don't think they have arrived because they've been veteran teachers and know everything there is to know." In making the final selection, the director also said that she thinks seriously about building a team of support teachers who complement each other's strengths and will be able to work well together.

Learning to Mentor

Just as the selection criteria tell us something about the official requirements for becoming a mentor, so the preparation that mentors receive tells us something about what mentor teachers in different contexts are expected to know and be able to do. *Training* is an apt label for the type of sessions that L.A. mentors must attend before they begin working with novices. It does not fit the Albuquerque context where support teachers learn their job by doing it and by talking about it on a regular basis with colleagues. Many of the mentoring practices we observed could be traced to the kind of preparation that mentor and support teachers received.

Mentor training. In Los Angeles, all mentor teachers, regardless of grade level and subject matter area, participate in the same 30-hour training which is offered in one-three hour sessions and delivered by a variety of presenters.[3] Created by the district's professional development staff, the training shapes mentors' expectations about their role and teaches them strategies and techniques to use. A big message is that mentors require new skills because their work differs from classroom teaching.

The opening sessions orient mentors to their new role. Veteran mentors describe the "wonders and traumas" of the work and state and local officials review procedures and guidelines which mentors must follow. Separate workshops focus on leadership styles, how to balance classroom teaching and mentoring responsibilities, and elements of good teaching as identified by teacher effectiveness research.

In sessions on assisting new teachers, mentors learn about typical problems that beginning teachers face and hear suggestions for how to respond (e.g., develop a resource file of materials useful to beginners, hold one or more orientation meetings at your school to explain procedures such as filling out grade reports). They also discuss the issue of developing relationships with novices. Sessions on classroom management and organization introduce mentors to various research-based systems and provide them with checklists for different area's of classroom management (e.g., organizing the room, developing rules and procedures, maintaining a management system).

The heart of the training focuses on classroom consultation, observation, and coaching. Mentors review observation and conferencing strategies, including the proper use of pre- and postobservation conferences, coaching, scripting (taking anecdotal records as the lesson unfolds). They practice these skills in small groups, scripting videotaped lessons and role-playing conferences.

Analysis. L.A. mentors receive little help integrating the variety of information and ideas they are exposed to with the actual demands and requirements of their work. Because they complete their training before starting their work with novices, mentor teachers must figure out for themselves how to form a working relationship with their trainees and how to adapt the coaching, scripting, and conferencing procedures to particular situations. The modularized training, with separate sections on discrete topics by different presenters, further complicates the task of putting together a coherent approach to helping novices learn to teach.

Although mentors have been chosen for their reputation as good classroom teachers, the training does not build on their practical expertise. Rather, it emphasizes the value of research-based prescriptions about effective teaching. The checklists and formats distributed throughout the training promote a view of teaching as a composite of discrete skills and strategies. The training manual hardly mentions issues related to the framing of worthwhile purposes, the needs and interests of students, the nature of the curriculum or the community.

Ongoing preparation and support.[4] In Albuquerque, support teachers learn about their work while doing it. Aside from a weeklong orientation at the end of August, most of the preparation that support teachers receive continues throughout the school year from September to June. By talking together on a regular basis about problems of practice and by reading and discussing selected articles about teaching and learning to teach, support teachers evolve a shared view of what it means to support and assist a beginning teacher.

Team building begins at a weekend retreat where veteran support teachers (those with one year experience) and new support teachers spend two days walking, talking, eating, and exploring their role. Talking about the retreat, a new support teacher said she appreciated the chance to "get to know each other socially" and she was glad to learn that her role was supposed to be "supportive and nonthreatening."

During the rest of the orientation, which takes place at the district's Educational Resources and Renewal Center, support teachers learn about the structure of the Graduate Intern Program and their role in it. They find out who their "clients" will be and where they teach. They also set up their own office at the ER&R Center. Support teachers help the director plan and run an orientation for all new teachers in the district. They also form two teams of four, each consisting of veteran and novice support teachers. These teams function as informal support groups during the year.

The main forum where support teachers develop their practice is a three-hour, weekly seminar with the program director. These Friday morning meetings have three agenda items: (1) business (e.g., who will attend different district workshops and conferences; who will recruit and interview new teacher interns and support teachers); (2) discussions of individual intern's progress (what is happening in different interns' classrooms, how individual interns are doing in their university seminars); and (3) reading and discussion of literature about teaching, learning to teach, and teacher education selected by the director in response to emerging issues.

Presenting individual cases is a regular activity in the staff seminar. Support teachers raise specific questions or describe particular situations which they need help addressing. At the beginning of the year, the conversation typically focuses on how to establish a trusting relationship so that novices will invite you into their classrooms and share their problems and questions. Veteran support teachers have a lot to say about this subject. Besides talking about individual clients and suggesting ways to help them, the support teachers discuss various articles about teaching and learning to teach. For example, in conjunction with a discussion of the question, "What practices do support teachers encourage with their clients?" the group read the following articles: "Teachers' Developmental Stages" by Lilian Katz, "Desirable Behaviors of Teachers" by Nate Gage, "The Model of Good Teaching" by Marie Hughes, and "What is Good Teaching?" by Jim Raths. Such readings provide food for thought and help support teachers place their own beliefs within a broader framework of ideas.

Analysis. The Albuquerque program provides support teachers with ongoing conversation and reflection about how to help novices learn to teach. Having a weekly seminar means that support teachers can deal with concerns as they arise. Because the group consists of first- and second-year support teachers, there is always a more experienced colleague to turn to for support and guidance. Combining discussions of specific problems with more theoretical discussions and readings helps support teachers develop a shared language for talking about teaching and learning to teach.

Talking about the problems of individual interns fits with the learner-centered view of teaching associated with the program. Just as support teachers consider the needs of individual clients, so they consistently focus novices' attention on the needs, thinking, and responses of individual children. One of the ways that support teachers do this is by taking on the role of participant/observer in the classroom, working with pupils, and then sharing with the novice information about pupils' responses. This strategy reinforces the importance of attending to how pupils make sense of the curriculum. It also serves

as an indirect way for support teachers to stretch novices' thinking about their practice. Instead of recommending changes directly, they build a case indirectly by showing the novice what is confusing or what could be extended in pupils' thinking.

The practices support teachers advocate—whole-language approaches to literacy, teaching mathematics with manipulative materials, organizing students into heterogeneous groups for work—fit with the general orientation of the program toward student-centered, process-oriented approaches to teaching and learning. Since most interns complete their preservice work at the University, they have encountered these ideas in methods courses and sometimes in their cooperating teacher's classroom. As a result, support teachers can concentrate on helping interns figure out how to act on familiar ideas in a particular setting.

The Practices of Mentors

To illustrate how the contexts of mentoring shape the practices of mentors, we present four snapshots of mentors at work. The first two pictures were taken in Los Angeles; the next two were taken in Albuquerque. In both sites we spent time shadowing mentor teachers and support teachers as they went about their work with beginning teachers.[5] We accompanied them to novices' classrooms, observing with them or watching them interact with novices and their students. We taped their conferences with beginning teachers. We also interviewed mentor teachers and support teachers about each visit, probing their goals and expectations and exploring their assessment of what happened and the thinking behind their actions.

Analyzing the interview and observational data within and across sites enabled us to see important differences in the way mentor teachers and support teachers looked at and talked about teaching. We also noted differences in the roles they played and the messages they conveyed about teaching and learning to teach. We analyze each pair of snapshots in terms of these contrasts, highlighting common features of mentoring practice in each site and relating those features to aspects of the context.

Los Angeles: Terri and Dave[6]

Terri has been teaching mathematics in Los Angeles for over 20 years. She has been working in a junior high, which is also a magnet school for gifted and talented youth in the northwest part of the city. She has been a mentor for beginning mathematics teachers in her school for three years. The junior high serves an integrated population of black and white working- and middle-class students.

Terri said that she prefers to talk with trainees before or after school or at lunch so that she does not have to leave her own classes. She also tries not to take up too much of their time.

> I don't feel that we need to make too many demands on these people. I feel that they should be stress-free in order to really address themselves to their teaching. . . . When it comes to conferencing, I think 30 minutes is long enough.

On the day of our visit, Terri arranged to watch Dave, a former engineer, teach an advanced algebra class to white middle-class "highly gifted" eighth graders. During the lesson, Terri did not take any notes "because it would make him uncomfortable." First Dave had students do some warm-up problems while he took attendance. After reviewing the homework, he discussed the new content for the day—quadratic equations and parabolas. Finally, he assigned homework problems.

Following the lesson, Terri began the 20-minute conference by asking Dave where he got the warm-

up problems and what purpose the activity served. Dave explained that he got the problems from the book and that he was simply trying "to keep students busy while I take roll." Believing that students recognize busywork, Terri replied: "What I'd like to see is if students understand what they did." Dave insisted they did understand. "I could tell from the answers they were giving and how quickly they were coming up with them."

Without comment, Terri said she was impressed with the pace of the lesson and the amount of material covered. "Do all people catch on that fast?" she asked. Dave explained that the class was a bit behind so he decided to "cover two topics today." He knew that "students could keep up." Terri told Dave that his content knowledge was "overwhelming." Dave said he sometimes has to review the materials because new techniques have been introduced since he was in school.

Although he feels confident about the mathematics, Dave said he occasionally wonders "how you can get the message across to students and keep them controlled?" Terri assured him that he would "learn that from experience. . . . In time you will know when students are listening even if papers are crumbling or they are talking." Today, she said, most students were "on task."

Terri asked Dave if he ever had students work in cooperative groups. When Dave registered his reluctance, she said they would talk about that next time. On the way out, Terri told Dave to "back off on the rules" and "talk to students individually."

After the conference, Terri told us that she thought Dave had tried to cover too much material in one lesson. Even though she is not as gifted as the students, Terri said, she questioned whether everyone learns that quickly.

Candace and Kevin

An English teacher for over 15 years, Candace teaches in a junior high located in a Hispanic, working-class neighborhood on L.A.'s east side. On the day of our visit, Candace observed Kevin teaching an eighth-grade remedial English class. She told us that she generally looks for "teacher direction rather than independent seatwork" because "remedial students need the teacher to model oral language."

While Kevin taught, Candace "scripted" the lesson, writing down what the teacher and students were saying. First Kevin told students to write a story about a train wreck. "You can make it up or draw on something you've seen." While the students wrote, Kevin took role, filled out tardy slips and distributed books. After 20 minutes, Kevin asked students to listen while he read out study questions for the next story about a train wreck. "These questions give some background for the story and give some reasons why we should read it." After explaining the questions, Kevin had students copy them in their notebooks which took the rest of the period.

In the conference that followed, Candace reviewed the main events of the lesson, finding something to praise about each segment, raising a question or two, and then moving on. She began by complimenting Kevin for displaying classroom rules. Then she asked whether students had read about or had any recent experiences with train wrecks. Kevin responded that the assignment was "just an introductory thing." After praising the study questions, Candace reminded Kevin that the school has a copy machine which would save students from having to write the questions down. Unfortunately, Kevin said, he didn't have the questions ready in time.

Changing topics, Candace asked Kevin whether he ever has students read aloud or silently. Kevin explained that he usually has students read the

story silently, answer the questions, then read the story and their answers aloud. "Which way to you think students get more out of the story?" Candace asked. "All three work," Kevin replied, because students are "very visual and kinesthetic. They like doing copy work and do it quietly, but reading is much more difficult."

Candace continued her questioning, asking Kevin how he handled vocabulary instruction, what he planned to do with the study questions, how often he tested students. Kevin explained that since he had "gone through the major skills," he was having students "apply the skills to the story."

Before ending the conference, Candace had Kevin consider how the lesson fit with the seven-step format endorsed by the district:

C: (Holding a handout) I was thinking about your lesson today . . . how would the writing fit in here?

K: (Looking at the handout) That's an introductory thing.

C: So, it'd be somewhere up here at the beginning?

K: Yeah, it's right before the initial instruction.

C: Okay, then the guided group practice would be?

K: The guided group practice is doing the study questions. The independent practice will probably be questions 9 and 10 on the guide. . . . The remediation activity will probably be a game on Thursday.

After the conference, Candace told the interviewer that she had concerns about some of Kevin's practices—he allowed too much time for a writing assignment; she wanted to see more student-teacher interaction; she thought the students needed more independent work.

Analysis

These two examples of mentoring deal with different subjects (math and English) and different student populations (white middle class and Hispanic working class). Still, they exhibit some common features of mentoring that we observed in Los Angeles. These features seem to follow from the official role definition, working conditions, and mentor training.

Observing and talking about teaching. Both Candace and Terri shaped the agenda of the conference around the sequence of the lesson. Candace worked from a script, while Terri worked from memory. Still, both mentor teachers walked through the lesson in chronological order, raising questions or making comments about what they had seen in the order in which it occurred. No clear purpose emerged from the conversation and it was difficult to determine what the mentor teacher was trying to accomplish.

While Candace and Terri asked a few probing questions (e.g., "Do all students catch on that fast?" "Which way do students get the most out of the story?"), they did not explore Kevin's or Dave's responses. Like most of the Los Angeles mentors we studied, neither Candace nor Terri focused the conversation on the novices' thinking. In general, they tended to comment on the teachers' performance rather than pursue the thinking behind the performance.

Nor did the mentor teachers reveal a lot about their own thinking. Even when offering a suggestion, they rarely provided much of a rationale. We often heard mentor teachers giving suggestions to beginning teachers—include some writing in every English lesson; get the students to work the problems; don't talk over their thinking; have students read a book while you take attendance—but we rarely heard a mentor teacher elaborate on why these were good things to do.

Enacted roles. In these conferences, Terri and Candace take on two roles common to other mentor teachers we observed. On the one hand, they speak as local experts on teaching, advocating practices that reflect their own experience, district policy and teacher effectiveness research. Terri tells Dave that students recognize busywork. She also points out that most students were "on task." Candace tells Kevin to back off on the rules and talk to students individually. She also has him analyze his lesson in terms of the seven-step lesson plan format.

At the same time, both mentors adopt the stance of a neutral observer, avoiding any explicit evaluation of the practices they observed. While Candace disapproved of the idea of busywork, she did not pursue the matter with Kevin. While Terri was skeptical about whether all students catch on so quickly, she accepted Dave's reply that they did. This neutral stance may reflect a belief, widespread among teachers, that teaching expresses an individual's style or personality which is fixed and cannot be changed. In fact, when we asked Candace whether she approved of all the things Kevin had done, she made such an argument:

> Kevin has his own personality . . . his own attitudes. I'm much more strict and I don't want to say that I think all teachers should have my style because that's one thing I try to respect—that you have hundreds of different styles.

Mentor teachers may also avoid critique because they equate it with evaluation, something they are not supposed to do (Parker, 1991). The procedural emphasis of the training may further encourage such a stance. While we saw mentor teachers using the strategies they learned about in their training (e.g., scripting lessons, asking probing questions, findings things to praise), they often did so in mechanical rather than purposeful ways. They did little to help novices develop judgement about their actions.

Messages about teaching and learning to teach. In these examples, the mentor teachers express two different messages about teaching. Sometimes they seem to be saying that good teaching is defined by teacher effectiveness research and district policy. Thus Candace promotes the seven-step lesson plan, Terri encourages Dave to consider cooperative grouping strategies and all the mentors we observed helped novices decipher the districts' curriculum guides.

Other times mentor teachers convey the notion that teaching is highly individualistic. If, as Candace put it, there are "hundreds of different [teaching] styles," then each teacher has to figure out his or her own unique way of doing things. This fits with the view that one learns to teach by teaching, a message Terri explicitly states. It also reinforces an idiosyncratic orientation which endorses personal preference and experience as the basis for shaping ones practice.

Pete and Frank

The day we shadowed Pete, a support teacher, we met at 8:00 in Frank's third-grade classroom which is in an ethnically diverse, inner city elementary school in Albuquerque. Frank had asked Pete to work with a small group of students who were having trouble with multiplication. He had been doing some "skill and drill" work with them, but wasn't sure they were getting it. On the way to school, Pete explained his expectations to us:

> I don't have a very specific goal except that both of us will think more about what goes on with kids. . . . I think we'll both be trying to clarify what are we trying to get kids to understand when they multiply and what can eight-year-olds, what kind of sense can they make and what kind of manipulatives can we use to help make sense of that.

Pete did not arrive empty-handed. He brought a book (*How Children Learn Mathematics* by Richard Copland, 1984) and a bag of small games pieces

and rubber bands to use in helping students get the idea of separating things into sets. The conversation began with Pete listening while Frank explained his confusion about the numbers in a multiplication problem—"Which is the number of sets and which is the number of items in a set?"

After a while, Pete shifted the conversation from Frank's confusion to their plans for the morning. Would Frank like to see what he was planning to do with the kids? Frank listened as Pete described how he would use the cubes and rubber bands to help students represent the times tables. He also accepted the extra materials Pete had brought, putting aside the worksheet he had prepared. When the children arrived, Pete worked with a small group for about 20 minutes and then left for another appointment.

In the interview following the visit, Pete explained that he wanted to show Frank the strategy of using game pieces and rubber bands, even though he did not necessarily intend for him to "do it that way." He also planned to use data gathered from working with the children to talk with Frank about how children make sense of mathematics. "One of the things we can always keep thinking about . . . in a class of 24 kids is how much variety there is in their understanding of mathematics and how very individual it is." Later in the interview, he talked about the kind of thinking he would "model" for Frank and why he believed that was important in teaching:

> I would say, for example, "Look at Louis, I wonder what he was thinking, but I don't have a theory." It seems important to give him examples of how I wonder about the work, as a teacher, how questions come up, how I say, "I wonder what is going on here. It could be this, it could be this. What are the factors contributing to this?"

Flora and Ned

From reading the self-analysis paper that Ned had written for the intern seminar, Flora, a support teacher, gleaned a list of "specifics" that Ned wanted to work on: "Have a student-centered class; enhance home/school communication; find more ways to allow students to stretch their abilities themselves." Flora explained to us that she would keep these ideas on file to help her in diagnosing Ned's concerns.

On the day of our visit, we found Flora and Ned standing in the middle of the classroom staring at Ned's new desk arrangement. Instead of having five groupings of students, he now had three groupings arranged in long tables.

> N: It has good points and bad points. It's working out well in terms of space and being able to move around . . . but the difficulties are that it's student-selected seating, so naturally the pals are sitting together. That makes it real tempting for them to visit instead of getting down to business. . . . It's the ongoing experiment.
>
> F: Sometimes if they really want to sit together bad enough, you can hold that over their heads. I once had a group of five boys who had been asking to be together for ages. Finally all of us sat down and talked about it and they thought they could handle it real well. I'll tell you they were the best group in the room. . . . I was wondering if you were keeping track of things going on in the groups.
>
> N: Yes, I continue to do that with the points but it's difficult to have much peer pressure when you have that many people.
>
> F: Yeah, from this end to that end there's not much communication.

When Ned left the room for a few minutes, Flora confided in the researcher that she was "concerned" because the new arrangement didn't facilitate "student communication": "I like children

to be able to talk together but this arrangement does not facilitate them working together."

When Ned returned, he and Flora continued talking for about 15 more minutes. Ned described the science experiments he was doing and his upcoming plans in language arts and social studies. He thanked Flora for a book she had given him on interviewing and said he planned to use it in preparing students to interview people for their class newspaper. Then he explained what he would be teaching after lunch.

Flora stayed to observe and then left, handing Ned a page of notes and arranging a time to talk. "In the notes," she told the researcher, "I told him it was good that he told the children to clear their desks . . . if you are going to tell them to do something, then you really have to follow through and see that they do it." They would read through the notes together at their next meeting.

Two days later, in a follow-up interview, Flora said that she planned to talk with Ned about a book on classroom environments that she has also loaned him. The book helps teachers "think about what you are facilitating when you design a room arrangement."

Analysis

These descriptions of Pete and Flora at work illustrate some distinctive characteristics of clinical support that are deliberately fostered by the Graduate Intern Program. They also reveal common views of teaching and learning to teach that support teachers convey through their work with beginning teachers. These views apply equally to support teachers who see themselves as learners.

Observing and talking about teaching. When support teachers observe and talk about teaching, they tend to focus on learning. Pete plans to talk with Frank about how different pupils made sense of multiplication and Flora plans to talk with Ned about the impact of the new desk arrangement on students' learning. Both provide novices with feedback about what their pupils are doing and thinking as a way of helping them reflect on and refine their teaching.

Besides fostering the habit of seeking evidence of student thinking and learning, Pete and Flora want to know what their novices are thinking. Pete listens patiently while Frank explains his confusions about multiplication. Flora listens as Ned describes the pros and cons of the new room arrangement. Based on their analysis of novices' needs, these support teachers, like their colleagues, provide theoretical readings to extend novices' thinking and understandings and to help them develop a principled understanding of teaching.

Enacted roles. In these interactions, Pete and Flora adopt the stance of a co-learner. While they have considerable expertise to share, they do not control the agenda. Rather they try to work from the novices' self-defined concerns, guiding them in directions that seem productive given their knowledge and experience and their continuing study of teaching. Pete calls himself a "co-thinker" and consciously models "wondering about teaching." Flora wants to help Ned think about how his new room arrangement helps or hinders student learning.

When Pete and Flora see practices they do not endorse, they neither look the other way nor directly confront the novice. Rather, they find a way to support the novices' initiatives while encouraging what they consider good practice. Pete shows Frank another way to teach multiplication. Flora brings a book to stimulate Ned's thinking about the classroom environment. A common topic in Friday morning staff seminars

is how to balance the learning needs of the novice teacher and the learning needs of their pupils in the light of what support teachers believe about good teaching. The fact that support teachers have no formal responsibility to evaluate does not release them from the obligation to appraise and develop novices' practice in defensible directions.

Messages about teaching and learning to teach. Messages about teaching and learning to teach conveyed by support teachers were fostered by the Graduate Intern Program. One message was the importance of basing teaching on particular knowledge of students and learning. Like Pete, support teachers often worked in classrooms gathering data about the understanding and thinking of individual students to share with the novice teacher.

Support teachers also modeled a second program message—that good teachers are also learners. In learning to teach, experience is necessary but not sufficient. Good teachers continue to improve their teaching through reflection, experimentation, reading, collaboration. While Pete and Flora shared suggestions and materials from their own teaching experience, they also passed on readings in order to deepen novices' understanding and strengthen the rationale for their practice. Just as the support teachers viewed themselves as learners, so they encouraged their clients to see teaching as a form of inquiry.

Conclusion

This study shows how the contexts of mentoring shape the perspectives and practices of mentors. While the Teacher Trainee Program in Los Angeles and the Graduate Intern Program in Albuquerque both rely on experienced teachers to guide and support new teachers, the orientation and form of that work varies. Much of that variation can be accounted for by considering the working conditions, preparation, and social structures of mentoring.

Our comparative analysis provides an empirical basis for speculating about the likelihood that mentoring can challenge the traditional isolation among teachers and improve teaching. During the 80s, mentoring became a favored strategy in U.S. initiatives directed at school reform. In particular, mentoring seemed like an ideal way to address the needs of first-year teachers while rewarding outstanding experienced teachers. Policymakers pinned high hopes on mentoring, programs spread across the country, and advocates talked about mentoring as a key factor in school improvement.

From the literature (e.g., Brooks, 1987; Healy & Welchert, 1990; Huling-Austin, 1990; Little, 1990; Morey & Murphy, 1990; Zimpher & Rieger, 1988) and from our empirical work (e.g. Feiman-Nemser, 1991; Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1990; Parker, 1990), we have identified three perspectives on mentoring in relation to teacher induction. The first perspective casts mentors as local guides; the second casts mentors as educational companions; and the third sees them as agents of cultural change. The promise of mentoring varies according to these different perspectives.

Mentors as local guides. Mentors who function as local guides try to smooth the entry of novices into teaching by explaining school policies and practices, sharing methods and materials, solving immediate problems. Their major concern is to help novices fit comfortably into a particular setting and learn to teach with minimal disruption. While such mentors willingly offer advice, especially when asked, they do not have a long-term view of their role. In fact, they expect to decrease their involvement as beginning teachers gain confidence and control.

Mentors as educational companions. When mentors take on an educational role, they still help novices cope with immediate problems, but they

also keep their eye on long-term, professional goals such as helping them learn to uncover student thinking and develop sound reasons for their actions. Mentors work toward these ends by inquiring with novices into the particulars of their teaching situation, asking questions such as, "What sense did students make of that assignment? Why did you decide on this activity? How could we find out whether it worked?"

Mentors as agents of change. When mentors act as agents of cultural change, they seek to break down the traditional isolation among teachers by fostering norms of collaboration and shared inquiry. They build networks with novices and their colleagues. They create opportunities for teachers to visit each other's classrooms. They facilitate conversations among teachers about teaching.

As we have seen, different forms of mentoring emerge in different contexts. Formal expectations, working conditions, selection and preparation all create a set of constraints and opportunities that shape how mentors define and enact their role. And these contextual factors, in turn, affect what novices can learn from their mentors. The mentor teachers we observed in Los Angeles tended to function as local guides. They concentrated on helping novices feel comfortable and have a successful first year of teaching. Limited by time constraints and influenced by official expectations, they offered advice and solved immediate problems. Even though the mentor training projected a broader image of the mentor's role, it did not help mentor teachers learn to use new skills and strategies in educative ways.

The support teachers we observed in Albuquerque functioned as educational companions. While helping novices succeed in their own classroom, they sought broader professional ends. The focus of the Graduate Intern Program on professional development, the chance to work with novices full time, and the opportunity to develop and study their practice with colleagues encouraged support teachers to construe their role in educational terms.

Neither the mentor teachers nor the support teachers talked about themselves as agents of cultural change. Still, they did play an important role in socializing new teachers into a teaching culture characterized by particular norms and standards. What dispositions regarding collegial interaction are mentor teachers and support teachers likely to have fostered?

We predict that beginning teachers will come to value collegial exchange if they and their mentors regularly experience the power of observation and conversation as tools for improving practice. If, in contrast, novices regard mentors' help as temporary and mentors have few opportunities to profit from interactions with colleagues, there is little chance that novices will come to question traditional norms of noninterference and teacher autonomy. Research on what mentoring looks like in different contexts and what novices learn from their interactions with mentors can help policymakers and program planners understand the power and limits of this currently popular intervention and design more effective programs.

Notes

[1]The induction literature makes a distinction between assistance-oriented and assessment-oriented programs. The general consensus is that these two functions should be kept separate and that persons assigned to guide novices should not also evaluate them. Advocates of assistance-oriented programs rarely acknowledge that millions of teachers, as well as college professors, are expected to play this dual role all the time.

[2]The National Center for Research on Teacher Education (1985-1990) is the forerunner of the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

[3]Information about the training comes from three main sources: The *Leader's Guide*, a Far West Laboratory publication, edited by J. W. Little and L. Nelson (1990) and based on the materials used in Los Angeles; responses by mentors to interview questions about their training; and interviews with district administrators responsible for the mentor teacher and teacher trainee programs.

[4]Our knowledge about the ongoing preparation and support comes from interviews with the program director and with support teachers about learning to be a support teacher. In addition, we observed the weeklong orientation and sat in on 5 three-hour staff seminars over a two-year period. We also collected and studied the weekly agenda for all Friday sessions during the period of data collection.

[5]In Los Angeles, we studied 12 mentor teachers working with the teacher trainees we were following. In Albuquerque, we studied 6 mentor teachers working with graduate interns we were following.

[6]Names of mentors and teachers are pseudonyms.

References

Brooks, D. (Ed.). (1987). *Teacher induction: A new beginning*. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Copeland, R. H. (1984). *How children learn mathematics: Teaching implications of Piaget's research* (4th ed.). New York: Macmillian.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1991). *Helping novices learn to teach: Lessons from an exemplary support teacher* (Research Report 91-6). East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Parker, M. B. (1990). Making subject matter part of the conversation in learning to teach. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *41*(3), 32-43.

Healy, C. C., & Welchert, A. J. (1990). Mentoring relations: A definition to advance research and practice. *Educational Researcher*, *19*(9), 17-21.

Huling-Austin, L. (1990). Teacher induction programs and internships. In W.R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 535-548). New York: Macmillan.

Little, J. W. (1990) The mentoring phenomenon and the social organization of teaching. *Review of research in education* (Vol. 16, pp. 297-351). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Little, J. W., & Nelson, L. (Eds.). (1990). *A leader's guide to mentor training*. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Morey, A., & Murphy, D. (Eds.) . (1990). *Designing programs for new teachers: The California experience*. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

National Center for Research on Teacher Education (1988) Teacher education and learning to teach: A research agenda. *Journal of Teacher Education*. *39*(6), 27-32.

Odell, S. (1990). *Mentor teacher programs*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Parker, M. B. (1990). *Adolescent dancing and the mentoring of beginning teachers* (Research Report 90-13). East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Education.

Stoddart, T., & Floden, R. E. (Eds.). (in press). *Alternate teacher certification programs: Promises and problems*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Zimpher, N., & Rieger, S. (1988). Mentoring teachers: What are the issues? *Theory into Practice*, *27*, 175-182.

Administrative Staff

Director: Mary Kennedy

Associate Director: G. Williamson McDiarmid

Study Directors: Linda Anderson, Deborah Ball, Daniel Chazan, Helen Featherstone, Sharon Feiman-Nemser, G. Williamson McDiarmid, Susan Melnick, Barbara Neufeld, Kenneth Zeichner

Director of Dissemination: Cassandra Book

Project Manager: Steven Kirsner

Communication Specialist: Debra Peterson

Editor: Sandra Gross

Production Assistant: Tamara D. Hicks

NCRTL Special Report
Spring 1992

This *NCRTL Special Report* is published by the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, College of Education, Michigan State University. The NCRTL is funded primarily by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the Office or Department. Third-Class postage is paid at East Lansing, MI. ISSN 1054-7673.

Please send change of address notification to NCRTL Mailing List, 116 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824-1034. Please include the address label from this issue. Phone (517) 355-9302. Fax (517) 336-2795.

MSU is an affirmative-action, equal-opportunity institution.

NCRTL

Michigan State University
National Center for Research
on Teacher Learning
College of Education
116 Erickson Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824-1034

Non-Profit Organization
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
East Lansing, Michigan
PERMIT NO. 21

LIZ DUBRAVCIC
NAT'L CTR FOR RES IN VOC.
1960 KENNEY ROAD
COLUMBUS OH 43210